

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 remain pending after amendment.

Claim Amendments

By this amendment, claim 6 is cancelled and the limitations thereof added to claim 1. Editorial revisions are made in claim 1. The dependency of claim 7 is amended accordingly. New claims 9 and 10 are added. No new matter is added by this amendment.

Replacement Abstract

Applicants submit herewith a substitute Abstract.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner objects to the specification for the reason that several editorial errors exist in the previously-submitted substitute Abstract. A new Abstract is submitted herewith which corrects the noted errors. The objection is thus moot and should be withdrawn.

Objection under 35 USC 132(a)

Applicants' prior response is objected to under 35 USC 132(a) as improperly introducing new matter into the disclosure. This objection is respectfully traversed.

The basis of the objection is an inadvertent error in the Abstract added by the prior response. This error is corrected by the Abstract attached hereto. The objection is thus moot and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112 (paragraph two)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 (paragraph two) as not distinctly claiming the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

In response, the claims are amended in an attempt to more clearly define the claimed invention. The rejection is thus believed to be without basis and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112 (paragraph one)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 (paragraph one) as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response, the claims are amended in a manner consistent with the kind suggestion of the Examiner. The rejection is thus believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Waber. This rejection respectfully is traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

In response, claim 1 is amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection. Claim 1 is amended to add the term “standard” in relation to the wheel rim defined by the claim. Also, the limitations of claim 6 (not rejected by the Examiner) are added to claim 1 to more clearly define the boundary between the radially outer part and the radially inner part.

As claims 2-8 were previously indicated as being directed to allowable subject matter in the Office Action of October 6, 2005, the incorporation of the limitations of claim 6 into claim 1 should render allowable claim 1 as well as those claims depending therefrom.

As a result, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) is believed moot and should be withdrawn.

New Claims 9 and 10

New claims 9 and 10 are added which are also believed to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Claims 9 and 10 generally correspond to claims 1 and 2 with the exception that claims 9 and 10 are directed to the combination of a pneumatic tire and a wheel rim, and the lack of reference to a "standard" wheel rim. Claims 9 and 10 are accordingly believed to be allowable for the same reasons asserted for claims 1-5 and 7-8.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same earnestly is solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Andrew D. Meikle at (703) 205-8000 to discuss such matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Andrew D. Meikle

Reg. No. 32,868

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000


ADM/JWH/ej